

Reporting Form #3: DCOF Quarterly Progress Report

Grantee Name: **CHF INTERNATIONAL**

Grant Number: **SPANS-30**

Primary Contact Person for This Report: **Milton FUNES**

Project Name: **Ishema Mu Muryango ('Pride for the Family' in Kinyarwanda)**

Project Start Date: **April 1, 2013**

Project End Date: **June 30, 2015**

Reporting Quarter Dates: **April 1 – June 30, 2014**

1. Describe any significant highlights/accomplishments that took place during this reporting period. Your response should be at least one (1) page

During this quarter the following activities were implemented:

Preparation of families for Reintegration: Assess child readiness

Family Tracing

Family tracing for 140 children from ONN (95) and HOH (45) was conducted. This includes 65 children and young adults living in Orphelinat Noel de Nyundo and 75 children and young adults in Home of Hope. The tracing brought the social workers to meet with multiple families to understand the internal family context and plan the best option for each child. This process involved reestablishing connections between the adults, who brought the children into the institution, and finding out what, if any, other relationships are present. This process also advanced the team by better understanding the children's background.

Assess Family Capacity

Family assessment was completed for 70 children and young adults; ONN (60) and HoH (10). From this family assessment, the team understands the needs and risks of family capacity. This includes root causes of child placement into institutions, which have to be addressed before family reintegration. These assessments cover family relationships, education levels, health status, family economic status, legal status, shelter, and potential community resources to determine whether/or not the families fulfill the reintegration criteria.

Family and Child Preparation

144 children and young adults along with their families prepped to move out of institutional care into family based care, giving priority to birth and extended families. Family preparation included: individual and group sessions conducted by social workers and psychologists with children and young adults; as well as with their families for readiness discussions in regard to transitioning to family based care from institutional care. Parent visiting children in the institution and children visiting families at home were also facilitated.

Reintegration of Children in Healthy Homes and Schools

Child Placement into Family-based Care

89 children and young adults were reintegrated during this period. Of the 89 children and young adults, 84 from ONN and 5 from HOH were placed into alternative family based and alternative care which prioritizes birth/extended families. From Home of Hope, 4 children were reintegrated into 4 extended families and 1 child into kinship care family.

From ONN 9 children were reintegrated into 7 birth families, 35 into 28 extended families, 3 into 3 foster families, 7 children were welcomed into kinship families and 30 young adults were integrated into 13 independent living families. Five children from HOH constitute the first cohort of children placement under the IMM program since permission to work was granted by the institution management.

Building Resilience of Families

Nutrition

18 Community Health Workers (CHWs) received training on Children's Basic Health and Nutrition. These CHWs were equipped to start nutrition groups for 49 children, under five, placed in Rubavu district. Groups have been established.

Food Security (Farmer Field Schools)

26 Community volunteers were trained on the FFS methodology to start services; 73 children and young adults were reintegrated in Rubavu district. 73 families are now members of a FFS group in their communities.

Savings & Lending Groups

31 Community volunteers were trained on Internal Savings and Lending Group (ISLG) methodology, in order to assist 59 children, placed in Rubavu district. Community volunteers have motivated families to become part of a group and they are now introducing the savings group methodology at the community level.

Early Child Development

22 Playgroup facilitators were trained and provided with kits to establish playgroups corresponding to 41 children, under five, placed in Rubavu district.

Community Psychosocial Support

43 Community Psychosocial Workers (CPWs) were trained and equipped to provide psychosocial support and prevention corresponding to 127 children and young adults placed in Rubavu District. All community volunteers and groups supported through IMM program extend their services and membership to the community and are not limited to targeted children from institutions for a better integration in the community life.

Alternative Care and Prevention Services

Foster care

75 foster caregivers were identified and 58 were assessed. All 75 potential foster caregivers were identified through awareness meetings organized by members of childcare networks in Rubavu and Nyarugenge districts. A local organization with the mission to support the recruitment of foster caregivers countrywide was approached to receive technical assistance to increase the number and get access to quality foster caregivers in other districts.

Develop prevention and emergency alternative care services

During this quarter and in close collaboration with local authorities, 27 children were prevented from institutionalization in Rubavu and Nyarugenge Districts as follows:

Nyarugenge: 7 children; 3 boys and 4 girls were prevented from family separation and institutionalization.

Rubavu: 20 children; 12 boys and 8 girls were prevented from family separation and institutionalization.

A detailed schedule of all children prevented of institutionalization during quarter is found in the Appendix #2 of this report. The prevention of family separation and new institutionalization of children was achieved as a result of the emerging gate keeping mechanism which is being promoted in childcare networks in both the above districts.

Community Sensitization

Sensitization meetings for child care/protection networks were conducted in Rubavu, a total of 471 people attended these meetings. Among participants a key decision made was to extend childcare network from sector to cell level to reach more community members and provide timely support to families at risk of breakdown.

Provide pre-service and in-service training to 20 NCC social workers and psychologists

Technical support supervision was provided to **27 NCC professionals** working in Rubavu and Nyarugenge Districts. Technical supervision was present to ensure respect, quality and standard about best decision for each individual child. NCC professionals were also supported in improving their planning skills by applying initial child assessment findings to inform service plan.

2. Describe any unforeseen obstacles or challenges that are having a negative impact on the implementation of the grant activity. For any mentioned, please describe your possible strategy for resolution. Your response should be at least half-a-page.

- One key challenge has been to reach the dispersed children placed into family based care to timely provide community services. 153 (54%) children are located in Rubavu where ONN is located, however other 132(46%) are placed in 22 other districts across the country. To address this challenge the IMM team is setting up district clusters for which mobile teams will be assigned to better organized community volunteers for the different community services.
- Another challenge has been finding alternative services for 24 young adults with disabilities (13 males and 11 females) from ONN whose reintegration cannot be possible or suitable. IMM program has partnered with the Ubumwe Community Center (UCC), to fill this gap through the provision of special daycare services to people with disabilities. Discussions continue between IMM, UCC, local leaders and The Point Foundation around defining appropriate community-based living¹ to not leave them behind in the deinstitutionalization process.

3. Describe any significant program learning that has taken place in the recent reporting period (*refer to Form #3b for guidance*).

Initial child assessment should be completed before undertaking any other subsequent activities; such as family tracing to plan strategically for staff, time and cost effectiveness. Originally Initial Child Assessment and Family Tracing were conducted in parallel, however after collecting and analyzing all information through the initial child assessment the IMM team was able to make a determination that alternative processes may be more beneficial.

Tracing for multiple children is now conducted simultaneously especially when they are from the same area of origin. Prevention strategies are also being established in areas identified as hot spots for children abandonment. It is clear that a successful deinstitutionalization program requires the combination of prevention services alongside the gradual transitioning of children from residential care into family-based care. All of which informed by the results from initial child assessments.

¹ **Community-based living** is a neutral way of defining community-based services for **assisted living for people with disabilities**. The recommended placement decision will be clearly mentioned by the time of placement decision upon common agreement between the stakeholders.

4. Comment on the status of the activity as compared with the agreed-to work plan. Explain whether you are behind, consistent with, or ahead of the work plan. Describe any proposed changes to the work plan that are needed in order to achieve the project outcomes. Your response should be at least half-a-page.

The following schedule shows IMM targets, achievements and deviations for this quarter, the fiscal year and LOP.

No	Activity	Targets			Achievement			Deviation		
		Q3	FY14	LOP	Q3	FY14	LOP	Q3	FY14	LOP
1	Initial child assessment	0	241	622	0	581	581	0	340	-41
2	Family tracing	86	396	519	140	397	547	54	1	28
3	Assess Family Capacity	86	343	466	70	262	339	- 16	-81	-127
3	Family & Child Preparation	127	361	466	144	294	349	17	-67	-117
4	Child Placement into Family-based Care	100	405	468	89	232	285	-11	-173	-183
5	Nutrition	44	153	153	18	18	18	-26	-135	-135
6	Food Security (Farmer Field Schools)	78	314	314	27	27	27	-51	-287	-287
7	Savings & Lending Groups (ISLG)	78	314	314	31	31	31	-47	-283	-283
8	Early Child development	29	118	158	41	41	41	12	-77	-117
9	Psychosocial Support (Community)	109	436	581	127	127	127	18	-309	-454

Explanations

The following remarks are based on the comparison of targets versus achievements for the Fiscal Year:

- **Initial Child Assessment**

This activity has been accomplished at 100% for the LOP. The difference between the 622 versus 581 children is 41, 622 (566 in ONN and 56 in HoH) was in the technical proposal which was considering the figures from National Survey of institutions conducted in November 2012. But after initial child assessment conducted by IMM professionals we realized that the real number of children and young Adults in these 2 institutions (ONN & HoH) is 581 (522 in ONN and 59 in HoH).

- **Family Tracing**

Family tracing has been achieved at 100% as stated in this fiscal year work plan.

- **Assess Family Capacity**

As of this quarter the Family Assessments have reached 76% of the FY target. The program expects to reach 100% by the end of the next period as the team is conducting field visits to more families in the same location.

- **Family & Child Preparation**

This activity was achieved at 81% of the FY target. The program expects to reach 100% by the end of the next period.

- **Child Placement into Family-based Care**

As of Q3 the Child Placement into Family-based Care has reached **57%** of the FY target. The program expects to reach 100% by the end of the next period as the team is no longer working on child assessment, which took much of their time. The time spent on post-placement support is gradually being saved to focus on new reintegration following the increasing involvement of community volunteers.

- **Nutrition, Farmer Field Security, Savings & Lending Groups**

For this fiscal year all these activities are under achievement: Nutrition (11 %), Food Security (9%), and Saving & Lending Groups (10%). The IMM team has recently engaged a team of well experienced trainers from Global Communities' Rwandan Partners Organizations (RPOs) who will be in charge to provide training to community volunteers and link families to community services. By working with the trainers already located in the districts where children have been placed IMM will be able to timely reach all children placed into families.

- **Early Child Development**

In Rubavu, 22 facilitators were trained to provide Early Child Development services to 41 children under 5 years (35%) using the playgroups methodology. All remaining children to be reintegrated in Rubavu district will be linked with already initiated services. For other districts, cluster trainings, are planned to speed up the linkages of families with community-based services.

- **Psychosocial support**

43 Community Volunteers were trained in psychosocial support, this service is to be provided to 127 (29%) children and their families in Rubavu district. The gap between the targets and achievements seem high, however with the already planned trainings in remaining districts, the majority of placed children will be covered.

5. USAID Branding and Marking:

Did any of your activities during this quarter result in printed materials, training events, web page development or other instances where the application of USAID logo/brandmark may be required? If so, please list and include examples of each.

Yes, USAID logo was used on materials provided to community services groups established after the training of volunteers.

6. Environmental Compliance (*Applies only if you received an approved Negative Determination with Conditions status*): N/A

7. Please complete the *Quarterly Technical Report Workplan Table (Appendix 1)*. Please note that this table has to be derived from the *Annual Workplan or Program Framework*. For activities planned for the previous quarter, indicate (yes/no) whether or not the activities were completed. Place any comments in the last column. Indicate what activities are planned for the coming quarter by marking an “X” in the *Workplan Table*.

See Appendix 1

8. Please provide data for the following common indicators (*refer to Form #3c for guidance*):

Indicator #1: Number of people (ages 18+) served:

Total This Period		Last Period Cumulative Reported		Cumulative as of October 1 of this USG fiscal year		Cumulative as of October 1 of this USG fiscal year (combined M+F)
(a) Male	(b) Female	(c) Male	(d) Female	e=(a+c) Male	f=(b+d) Female	g=e+f
76	83	103	110	201	212	413

Indicator #1a: Number of children (ages 0-17) served:

Total This Period		Last Period Cumulative Reported		Cumulative as of October 1 of this USG fiscal year		Cumulative as of October 1 of this USG fiscal year (combined M+F)
(a) Male	(b) Female	(c) Male	(d) Female	e=(a+c) Male	f=(b+d) Female	g=e+f
83	68	167	171	276	255	531

Indicator #2: Number of people trained:

Total This Period		Last Period Cumulative Reported		Cumulative as of October 1 of this USG fiscal year		Cumulative as of October 1 of this USG fiscal year (combined M+F)
(a) Male	(b) Female	(c) Male	(d) Female	e=(a+c) Male	f=(b+d) Female	g=e+f
35	68	28	55	63	123	186

Indicator #3: Number of organizations strengthened to improve capacity:

	Faith Based	Government	Non-Governmental	Community Based	Other	Total
Total This period	0	0	0	0	0	0
Last Period Cumulative Reported	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cumulative as of October 1 of this USG fiscal year	0	0	0	0	0	0

9. If available, please include photographs taken of project activities during this reporting period. Please limit your submission to five (5) photographs.



Community Psychosocial Volunteers trained in Rubavu District



Community Volunteers during Savings Groups kits distribution session in Rubavu District

10. Please compare the expected estimated budgeted cumulative USAID project expenditures to-date with the actual cumulative expenditures as follows:

- (a) Total Obligated Budget (USAID funded portion): \$ 998,371
- (b) Expected estimated budgeted cumulative project expenditures through the end of this quarter as per the grant budget: \$ 554,650.56 ⁽¹⁾
- (c) Actual cumulative. USAID funded project expenditures to-date: \$ 436,939.35 ⁽²⁾
- (d) Subtract (c) from (b): \$ 117,711.21
- (e) Divide (d) by (b) and express as a percent: 21 %

(1) Total project budget divided by number of months in the project, multiplied by the number of months elapsed as of this report date.
 (2) Actual cumulative USAID expenditures should match the amount shown on the accompanying Quarterly Financial Report.

If (e) is more than 15% please briefly explain the reasons for the variance (Describe why the cumulative expenses as per the plan vary widely from the actual cumulative expenditures):

The main reasons for this under spending is due to delays in finalizing the placements of children, which in turn meant we could not start with activities beyond placements. Activities such as reintegration packages and community services tool kits. As explained earlier in this report the program expects to achieve its reintegration targets for the fiscal year and consequently this will be reflected in the next quarter financial statement.

Certification:

I certify that the above information is accurate and correct.

Milton FUNES

Country Director

Milton Funes

July 30, 2014

APPENDIX 1

Quarterly Work Plan Report Table

Quarter Covered by Report: (April) 1, 2014 to (June) 30, 2014

No.	ALL ACTIVITIES PLANNED FOR THIS REPORTING QUARTER	ACTIVITY STATUS				COMMENTS/ DETAILS (Briefly, provide key information on the progress of the activity this quarter)	No.	ALL ACTIVITIES PLANNED FOR NEXT QUARTER
		YES ²	NO ³	YES/ONGOING ⁴	NO/ONGOING ⁵			
1	Preparation of children and families for reintegration							
1.1	Complete initial child assessment	YES				All the 59 children in HoH and 522 children/young adults of ONN were assessed and service plan conducted.		
1.2	Family tracing and assessment			YES/ONGOING		Family tracing and assessment is going well as the number of the so called “no trace” is reducing	1.1	Conduct family tracing and assessment
1.3	Family & Child Preparation			YES/ONGOING		All children and families underwent preparation session through meetings and one to one support with professionals.	1.2	Family & Child Preparation
2	Reintegration of children into healthy homes and families							
2.1	Child Placement into Family-based Care			YES/ONGOING		89 children were placed into family foster care. 84 are from ONN and 5 first children placed from HoH	2.1	Child Placement into Family-based Care
2.2	Registration with Local Authorities			YES/ONGOING		All children placed into family-based care are registered with Local Authorities for their further post-placement support	2.2	Registration with Local Authorities

² YES: Activity was planned only for this Q and was completed

³ NO: Activity was planned only for this Q and was not completed

⁴ YES/ONGOING: Activity was planned for more than this Q, and targets for this Q were completed

⁵ NO/ONGOING: Activity was planned for more than this Q, and targets for this Q were not completed

2.3	Tailored reintegration package: Access to education, health and shelter (Month 0-12)			YES/ONGOING		Activity work around influencing former institution donors to reallocate their funds to continue supporting children education and Health after reintegration was successful.	2.3	Tailored reintegration package: Access to education, health and shelter (Month 0-12)
3	Building Resilience of Families							
3.1	Mapping of services: playgroups, Farmer Field Schools, Internal Savings and Lending Groups, Nutrition groups and Psychosocial services			YES/ONGOING		Needs assessment for community services for each family with a reintegrated child was conducted alongside family assessment	3.1	Mapping of services: playgroups, Farmer Field Schools, Internal Savings and Lending Groups, Nutrition groups and Psychosocial services
3.2	Orient community psychosocial workers			YES/ONGOING		CPWs were identified to timely support and refer families and children. This was done for each child but training was provided to CPWs in Rubavu district	3.2	Orient community psychosocial workers
3.3	Linking families to community-based services			YES/ONGOING		Families that welcomed children were gradually linked to community-based services especially in Rubavu where most children are being placed	3.3	Linking families to community-based services
4	Alternative care							
4.1	Foster care			YES/ONGOING		51 new foster care were assessed.	4.1	Foster care
4.2	Adoption			YES/ONGOING		Foster care candidates were also sensitized to undergo adoption requirement to have a permanent placement for children who are likely not to be reintegrated with their birth or kinship care	4.2	Adoption
4.3	Childcare networks			YES/ONGOING		Childcare networks meetings were conducted in Rubavu from district up to sector levels and the decision made was to extend childcare networks to the cell level.	4.3	Childcare networks
4.4	Contribute to the development of the national curriculum and training			YES/ONGOING		Foster care guidelines are still being discussed as well as the	4.4	Contribute to the development of the national curriculum and

	materials					approach around community volunteers to support children post-placement.		training materials
5	Capacity Building							
5.1	Assist NCC to deliver pre-service training to Social workers and Psychologists	YES				In service training was conducted for NCC professionals and we assisted recruitment of the new cohort of NCC professionals	5.1	Assist NCC to deliver pre-service training to Social workers and Psychologists

Summary of Placement Progress as of Q3 FY14

	Total children	Children placed	Remaining in the institution
ONN	522	280	242
HoH	59	5	54

APPENDIX #2 CHILDREN PREVENTED FROM INSTUTIONALIZATION Q3FY14

No	District	Age of child	Sex	Type of prevention	Risk factor	Solution
1	Nyarugenge	2 months	M	Institutionalization	Abandonment	Foster
2		3 months	M	Institutionalization	Death of their mother at maternity ward	Kinship
3		1 year	M	Family separation	Poverty	Kinship
4		3 Months	F	Institutionalization	Death of their mother at maternity ward	Kinship
5		1 year	F	institutionalization	Abandonment	Foster
6		2 years	F	Family separation	Poverty	Birth Family
7		6 years	F	Family separation	Family conflicts	Birth Family
8	Rubavu	12 months	F	Institutionalization	Abandonment	Emergency Foster Care
9		3 months	F	Family Separation	Family Conflicts	Kinship
10		14 years	F	Institutionalization	Abuse & Neglect	Birth Family
11		12 years	M	Institutionalization	Abuse & Neglect	Birth Family
12		10 years	F	Institutionalization	Abuse & Neglect	Birth Family
13		5 years	M	Institutionalization	Abuse & Neglect	Birth Family
14		2 years	F	Institutionalization	Abuse & Neglect	Birth Family
15		9 years	M	Institutionalization	Mental illness	Birth Family
16		16 years	F	Institutionalization	Abandonment	Kinship
17		1 day	F	Institutionalization	family conflicts	Kinship
18		2 years	M	Family separation	Poverty	Birth Family
19		2 years	F	Family separation	Poverty	Birth Family
20		3 years	M	Family separation	Family conflicts	Birth Family
21		13 years	F	Family separation	Poverty	Kinship
22		12 years	M	Family separation	Poverty	Kinship
23		8 years	M	Family separation	Poverty	Kinship
24		6 years	M	Family separation	Poverty	Kinship
25		11 years	M	Family separation	Poverty	Kinship
26		6 years	M	Family separation	Poverty	Kinship
27		1,5 years	M	Family separation	Poverty	Kinship

